



Telford & Wrekin

C O U N C I L

**COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW
PARISH OF LILLESHALL DONNINGTON & MUXTON
LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT IN
HEALTH ACT 2007
DRAFT PROPOSALS**

**THESE DRAFT PROPOSALS HAVE BEEN PUBLISHED BY THE COUNCIL
ON:**

7 FEBRUARY 2014.

**SUBMISSIONS AND COMMENTS ON THIS DRAFT PROPOSALS
DOCUMENT SHOULD BE MADE BY:**

9 MAY 2014

1. Introduction

1.1 Telford and Wrekin Council received a Community Governance Petition signed by 340 local government electors of the Lilleshall Ward of the Parish of Lilleshall, Donnington & Muxton, calling for a separate parish to be formed for their ward. The petition has been checked and found to be a valid petition in accordance with Section 80 of the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 (the Act). In accordance with Section 83 of the Act, the Borough Council is required by law to conduct a Community Governance Review. A similar request for a separate Lilleshall parish was received in 2009. A Community Governance Review was undertaken and it was at that time concluded that existing parish arrangements should remain unchanged other than the name of the parish council being amended to include Muxton. Government guidance requires a 2 year moratorium before a further review of that parish area be requested, this period has elapsed and a further review can now be held. The previous review attracted some criticism for being long and unnecessarily complex. This review has the aim of being straightforward and simpler to understand.

The public meeting held in October was a useful indicator of the views of residents. It highlighted a range of views, both those supporting a separate parish and those opposing any change to arrangements. The review will consider the tests required by legislation in producing recommendations and at the same time be very mindful of the views of the residents of the area under review.

1.2 This Review commenced on 2 October 2013, when the Boundary Review Committee of the Council published a Terms of Reference document and invited initial submissions from individuals or organisations who had an interest in the Review. In the Terms of Reference, the Council published a timetable for the Review and it published a consultation strategy. A public meeting was held on 14 October 2013 at Lilleshall Memorial Hall to discuss issues and questions regarding the review. The period for initial submissions

closed on 30 November 2013. The Council now publishes these Draft Proposals in response to the Community Governance Petition.

1.3 It will be seen that the Draft Proposals are that, in order to assist the council in making a final recommendation, there should be a ballot of Lilleshall electors to determine their views on the formation of a separate Lilleshall Parish. Reasons have been given to support the Draft Proposals. A summary of these reasons can be found in part 6 of this document.

1.4 In preparing these Draft Proposals, the Council has been mindful of the request of the petitioners and the initial submissions that have been received. The Council also has the role of balancing these requests and submissions against the wider requirements and duties that are placed upon it in the 2007 Act. In particular, the Council has a duty to ensure that community governance within its area:

- reflects the identities and interests of the community in that area;
- is effective and convenient, and
- takes into account any other, non-parish, arrangements for the purposes of community representation or community engagement in the area.

1.5 In Part 2 of the Terms of Reference document consideration was given to the question of consultation with the electors and other interested persons or bodies in this Review. The timetable for this Review has attempted to balance the legal requirement that the review be completed within twelve months with another legal requirement that consultation take place with electors and other interested persons or bodies during the decision making stages of the Review. The publication of these Draft Proposals will now trigger the next, stage of consultation.

1.6 The Terms of Reference document was intended to inform and open the local debate by providing extensive information on present parish governance

in Lilleshall and Donnington, the legislative framework for a Review and other policies that the Council felt were of importance.

1.7 The previous review was completed in April 2010, resulting in recommendations for no change to existing Parish arrangements. That review was characterised by strongly held views from residents both in favour of a separate Parish and subsequent counter petitions from residents supporting maintaining current arrangements.

Submissions received in this review so far indicate that a similar situation remains with strong views being expressed, both in favour of a separate Parish and in favour of maintaining current arrangements.

In Annex 1 of this document, details are included of the submissions that have been received since the publication of the Terms of Reference. A variety of submissions have been received. They present divided views about the request in the original Community Governance Petition. 54 electors from Lilleshall have made individual or joint submissions by letter or by e-mail. Of these submissions, 37 support a separate Parish council and 17 oppose it. Mr P Hawkins outlines his case for a separate parish and outlines an indicative budget for a separate parish council. He makes the case for a viable parish serving a distinct community of identity. Mr J Hockin also believes there is a strong case for a separate parish, taking the view that a ballot should be held regarding the formation of a separate parish. Mr Ralph Morgan, clerk to the Parish council, submits a case for parish arrangements that currently work well. He argues that a strong, cohesive and socially inclusive community already exists and that there is no requirement for change. Mr F Graham Platt does not believe that Lilleshall is a separate, recognisable community of identity. He does not believe that there is any evidence for the benefits and advantages of a separate parish for Lilleshall. A number of submissions in favour of a separate parish are very concise and do not contain any specific reasons for their support. Mr Andrew Baker, Chairman of the Parish council, believes that current arrangements work well and that a separate parish would lose the benefits of economies of scale which are available to the current parish. Simon Collier believes Lilleshall is a distinct community with the required infrastructure and that there should be a separate parish council

for Lilleshall. A number of submissions opposing a separate parish cite their disappointment that a further review has been triggered following the 2009 review. In addition, a number of submissions opposing change see little significant financial or community benefits from the creation of a separate parish. During the last review in 2009 Lilleshall and Donnington Parish Council made objections to the original petition, but has also taken the view that “if Lilleshall can prove that it can financially sustain itself, then it should become an independent parish of its own, should the majority of electors wish this. If so, two new parishes should be formed possibly called ‘Lilleshall Community Council’ and ‘Donnington and Muxton Parish Council’”. With these comments in mind and in the absence of definitive support it was agreed at the last meeting of the council’s Boundary Review Committee that a direct consultation take place. It is proposed that a postal ballot of Lilleshall electors should be held from 21 February to 7 March. The ballot would be a simple yes/no question and ask if electors were in favour of a Lilleshall Parish council.

2. The Parish of Lilleshall Donnington and Muxton

2.1 In Parts 3-5 of the Terms of Reference and the accompanying annexes, considerable information was provided about the existing Parish of Lilleshall Donnington & Muxton. (The full Terms of Reference document is available either in hard copy or on our website at the contact details provided in Section 8 below.)

2.2 The present parish of Lilleshall and Donnington comprises three wards: the Donnington ward with 4,970 electors and six councillors, the Lilleshall ward with 1,079 electors and three councillors, and the Muxton ward with 4,963 electors and six councillors. The Donnington ward comprises the modern area centre of Donnington together with commercial and industrial premises at its southern tip and in that half of the ward that lies to the north of the A518. At its very north, at Station Road and Humber Lane, the ward has further residential development at The Humbers which closely adjoins the

more rural Lilleshall ward. The Lilleshall ward is an extensive rural ward. Apart from some scattered farms and rural dwellings, the settlement is concentrated in the linear village of Lilleshall and at the estate type development at Body Road and Hill Road at The Humbers. The Muxton ward comprises three elements: the open agricultural and reclaimed land that comprises about two-thirds of the ward; the residential development at Donnington Wood to the west of Donnington Wood Way, and the residential development at Muxton, which is a mix of the older development of the original village of Muxton to the north and along the newer estate roads to its south.

2.3 In the Terms of Reference document, it was stated that the main considerations that the Council would need to be mindful of in coming to recommendations in this Review arise in Section 93 of the 2007 Act as outlined in paragraph 1.4 above. This identified three ‘tests’ which we would need to apply in the Review.¹ The first is what is described as the **‘community of identity’ test**: do the areas that constitute the present parish wards of Donnington, Lilleshall and Muxton represent distinctive communities of identity, deserving of separate parish status and individual parish representation? However, it was emphasised that this test cannot be considered in isolation from a second test: the **effective and convenient local government test**. To a large extent, this test may be thought of as a ‘viability’ test: do these parish wards have the viability to stand alone, not dependent one on the other, in the funding and provision of services that would compare with current service levels? However, viability is only a part – albeit a considerable part – of the effective and convenient local government test. The Council considers that it has a broad duty in law to promote effective and convenient local government across its Borough. Finally, the Council is required to take into account other organisations in the area that promote representation and engagement for its inhabitants and that thereby serve to reinforce the community of identity test.

2.4 It is the Council's duty to promote effective and convenient local government across the whole of our Borough. The area under Review was defined as comprising the existing Lilleshall ward of Lilleshall, Donnington & Muxton Parish council. In effect, the review has the potential to create one new parish for Lilleshall and to consider arrangements for Donnington & Muxton. Effectively, the review is looking at the potential for a separate parish council for Lilleshall. The original petition was from Lilleshall residents and followed on from a previous petition received in 2009. There have been no letters or requests concerning separation for Donnington or Muxton and therefore the review will focus on arrangements for Lilleshall.

3. The Community of Identity test

3.1 It was stated in the Terms of Reference document that parishes should reflect distinctive and recognisable communities of interest, with their own sense of identity. In the submissions received, there is little comment on whether Lilleshall is a distinctive community of identity. There seems little doubt that Lilleshall, situated, in a rural environment, differs greatly from the more urban Donnington and Muxton and it can be reasonably argued that it has its own physical identity. It can also be argued that Lilleshall has a more rural identity than the rest of the Parish and that is served by separate schools, community halls, churches and voluntary groups.

3.2 The government's Guidance states "Parishes should reflect distinctive and recognisable communities of interest, with their own sense of identity... the feeling of local community and the wishes of local inhabitants are the primary considerations.

3.3 It is straightforward to identify tangible and statistical differences between Lilleshall, Donnington and Muxton in terms of housing quality, indices of deprivation, age structures etc. These differentials do not necessarily substantiate the community of identity test; in isolation they are not proof that a community of identity either exists or does not exist. Some of the more robust communities of identity within the Borough – Wellington, for instance – encompass a wide diversity of residents, housing, social backgrounds, qualifications, and so forth, and yet their diverse inhabitants identify closely with their single community.

3.4 The Council will not lightly make a recommendation to cut off one area from another area on which it has a traditional and long-standing dependence. The government has emphasised in its Guidance that the interests of community cohesion should be taken into account in a Review. The division of a parish on the basis of indices of deprivation and similar considerations would appear to be contrary to government's Guidance.

3.5 Question 2 in the Terms of Reference document asked consultees to comment on whether they felt that an adequate infrastructure of meeting points, community halls, local schools, neighbourhood stores, community organisations, voluntary groups and so forth existed to support a distinct community of identity. The initial submissions and information collected in the last review have identified such an infrastructure as existing. A school, village hall, youth centre, cricket club, tennis club and many other voluntary groups and organisations are present in Lilleshall. A key question relates to the usage and inter-dependence of these facilities. On the other hand, Lilleshall is served by separate schools, playgroups, community halls, police teams and churches.

3.6 Although sound arguments for separation have been put forward for a separate parish council a number of the initial submissions have shown little appetite for change in the present structure of community governance. A number of residents are satisfied with the status quo in the Lilleshall Ward.

3.7 In summary, there is a reasonable argument that technically Lilleshall parish ward forms a distinctive community of identity, deserving of separate parish status. However, there is a distinct split in submissions received with a number of respondents strongly opposed to changing current arrangements. At this point it is important to consider that this is the second review in a few years and that it would be sensible and informative to gain the views of a larger group of local residents. In order to further substantiate and support the case a postal ballot of residents will be held in February to assess the views of the wider Lilleshall community. This information will further support the review's final proposals.

4. The present warding arrangement

4.1 The council considers that the present warding arrangements has worked well to ensure the separate representation of the different parts of the parish.

Furthermore, consideration must be given to the relationship between the parish ward boundaries and the boundaries of the Borough wards. The parish wards have been used as the building blocks for the Borough wards across much of the Borough, and the Borough wards therefore share the same boundaries with the parish wards. The maintenance of this co-terminosity is in the best interests of effective and convenient local government for the residents in The Humbers and at Donnington Wood: for those residents to be in one parish ward but in a different borough ward may result in confusion. The present ward boundary, while it may not be entirely ideal, is easily identifiable, fairly clearly understood and represents an appropriate parting of local attachments within a parish that comprises different parts.

4.2 Next, consideration is given to whether the numbers of councillors elected to the parish council by each ward continues to be appropriate. Section 95 of the 2007 Act requires consideration of any change in the number or distribution of the electors which is likely to occur in the period of five years beginning with the day when the Review starts. Table 3.2 of the Terms of Reference document presented electorate projections for the period 2013/14 – 2018/19. In the current financial and housing market conditions it is difficult to give a realistic assessment of the actual numbers of new dwellings that would be completed to occupation. Even so, if the projections were realised, there would be the following impact for levels of representation between the two wards.

Table 1 – Projected electorates and councillor entitlements for Lilleshall and Donnington Parish Council

	<i>Electorate 2013/14</i>	<i>Resulting Councillor Entitlement</i>	<i>Projected Electorate 2018/19</i>	<i>Resulting Councillor Entitlement</i>
Donnington Ward	4970	6.77	4980	6.59
Lilleshall Ward	1079	1.47	1109	1.47
Muxton Ward	4963	6.76	5243	6.94
		15		15

4.3 Although there will be a continuing shift of councillor entitlement away from the Lilleshall ward where development will remain static, this is not considered to be sufficient to recommend any change in the allocation of councillors between the three wards at this time. With three councillors at present, the Lilleshall ward has an apparent over representation in current electoral arrangements for the parish and this is a consideration in this review. Even so, this seeming over-representation acknowledges the traditional scales of representation in the parish, the need to support the warding arrangement by providing a balance of representation between the wards, and the more rural character and sparsity of population within the Lilleshall ward with the challenges with regard to representation.

4.4 It should be noted that the Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) have recently completed an electoral review of the Borough. They are required to have regard to the statutory criteria set out in Schedule 2 to the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009 (the 2009 Act). The Schedule provides that if a parish is to be divided between different wards it must also be divided into parish wards, so that each parish ward lies wholly within a single ward. They cannot recommend changes to the external boundaries of parishes as part of an electoral review. They only have the power to make changes to parish electoral arrangements where these are as a direct consequence of recommendations for principal authority warding arrangements. Should this review make final proposals for a separate Lilleshall parish then consequential orders will need to be laid. Their recommendations will take effect from May 2015 local elections and are:

Lilleshall, Donnington & Muxton Parish Council should return 15 parish councillors, as at present, representing five wards: Donnington East (returning one member), Donnington West (returning five members), Lilleshall (returning two members), Muxton (returning five members) and The Humbers (returning two members).

Should this review ultimately recommend a separate Parish council for Lilleshall then LGBCE would be informed and they would be required to lay

further consequential orders to reflect these arrangements.

5. Effective and Convenient Local Government

5.1 Central to the debate on whether effective and convenient local government can result from the formation of a separate parish of Lilleshall is the question of whether a separate Lilleshall parish council could prove to be a viable entity.

5.2 The parish council provided a budget for 2013-14, which was presented in Annex 2 of the Terms of Reference document. The parish council's income can be broken down as follows:

Table 2 – Income of Parish of Lilleshall Donnington & Muxton Parish Council

Source	Amount
Precept	205,675.00
Bank Interest	620.00
Reclaimed VAT	8,000.00
Advertising (Parish Magazine)	50.00
Cordingley Hall	0
Turreff Hall	15000.00
Talbot Centre (Tennis Club)	600.00
Lilleshall Allotments	723.79
Donnington Allotments	704.46

5.3 In turn, a careful exercise was undertaken in Tables 6.2 and 6.3 and the accompanying annexes of the Terms of Reference document to disaggregate the council tax base and the parish precept between the three wards of the present parish of Lilleshall and Donnington. The parish council's precept for 2013-14 is £205,675.00 (including grant of £26,270.00 from the Borough council). Tables at section 6 of this report show disaggregation data.

5.4 The disaggregation of a parish council's budget between its constituent wards is a very difficult exercise, but there also needs to be an attempt to provide a disaggregation for the Parish of Lilleshall Donnington & Muxton. The Parish Clerk has been asked to attempt to disaggregate the budget to show his expenditure as it relates to each of the three wards of the existing parish, and we have subjected this disaggregation to our own analysis. This is a very difficult exercise, but the Clerk's findings go some considerable way towards giving a balanced and realistic assessment of the situation that would confront three separate parish councils. This disaggregation is shown in Annex 2.

5.5 The existing parish council budget is compiled on the basis of four different headings. The first is the 'Parish Precept', which shows the parish's core income and its core expenditure: the clerks' salaries, employees' on-costs and the general administration costs. The total expenditure here is apportionable across the whole parish. The second heading is the 'Environment Budget'. In particular, this budget covers sixteen acres of open space at Muxton, closed churchyards in Lilleshall and Donnington, the Talbot Centre clubhouse and asphalt tennis courts at Lilleshall, Donnington toilets, the electricity, management, maintenance and renewal of 675 street lights and general maintenance. Elements of this budget, such as the general grounds maintenance allocation, and elements within the street lighting allocations, are apportionable across the whole parish. However, other elements, such as bus shelters and street lights, can be apportioned on the basis of the number of units in each ward, while other elements, such as Donnington Toilets or the Talbot Centre at Lilleshall are directly apportionable to a specific ward.

5.6 The spending from the parish council's environment budget in the Lilleshall ward is about 20 per cent of that overall budget. This could be an indicator that Lilleshall is "asset heavy" and dependent on the other two wards. However, the central administration costs revolving around the parish office may appear to favour Donnington, because that is where the office is located. Even so, it should be borne in mind that the Donnington ward does

generate most of the parish's other income. The present arrangement allows for a permanent parish office and permanent staffing.

5.7 The review has considered the most appropriate mechanism for apportioning those elements within the parish council's budget that are apportionable across its three wards. New parish councils would define new priorities and they would adjust their budgets accordingly, and it is therefore very difficult to forecast how the budget of a new parish council would evolve during the first year or two of its existence. For example, we understand that there is a potential cost for replacement of street lighting across the Parish which might make a significant dent in Parish council budgets. In effect, it is only possible to make an assessment based on the present budget of the existing parish council. There are only two mechanisms available for apportioning those elements within the budget of the existing parish council that are apportionable across its three wards; either by using the ratios provided by the council tax base or the ratios provided by the electorate, and these ratios are shown in Table 3.

Table 3 – Bases for apportioning the budget for Lilleshall Donnington & Muxton Parish Council

	<i>Apportionment based on Council Tax Base (%)</i>	<i>Apportionment based on Electorate (%)</i>
Donnington	37.99	45.1
Lilleshall	12.3	9.83
Muxton	49.72	45.07

The resulting apportionments of the budget are shown in Annex 2 to this document. It is acknowledged that each of the bases for apportioning the budget is far from ideal, and they show widely differing outcomes across the headings in the council's expenditure. The outcomes are shown below. The conclusions follow.

Table 4 – Disaggregation of the budget of Lilleshall Donnington & Muxton Parish Council – the basis for the disaggregation being the electorate

	<i>Lilleshall and Donnington Parish Council</i>	<i>Disaggregated to the Donnington Ward – by electorate</i>	<i>Disaggregated to the Lilleshall Ward – by electorate</i>	<i>Disaggregated to the Muxton Ward – by electorate</i>
Difference (Shortfall / Surplus)		9620.37	-199.55	22124.48

Table 5 – Disaggregation of the budget of Lilleshall Donnington & Muxton Parish Council – the basis for the disaggregation being the council tax base

	<i>Lilleshall and Donnington Parish Council</i>	<i>Disaggregated to the Donnington Ward – by council tax base</i>	<i>Disaggregated to the Lilleshall Ward – by council tax base</i>	<i>Disaggregated to the Muxton Ward – by council tax base</i>
Difference (Shortfall / Surplus)		2150.52	2260.64	27637.28

5.8 It is considered that a separate Lilleshall parish council could prove viable. It is assumed that a separate parish council would wish to look at the current level of grant funding that the present ward receives as part of its precepting work. Street lighting and bus shelters, a closed churchyard and the Talbot Centre would need to be maintained. Once again it is assumed that a separate Parish would make appropriate budgetary decisions. .

5.9 A significant part of the budget of a separate Lilleshall parish council would need to be set aside for street lighting. This is a potential issue as the Parish will be required to replace street lighting across the Parish area in the foreseeable future. Significant expenditure might put some pressure on a small Parish budget but it is assumed that the Parish would make budget adjustments or alternatively raise precept if this was ultimately required. It would be for a new parish council to consider how best to manage the street lighting in its area

5.10 The Lilleshall ward has a number of assets to maintain, more than neighbouring rural parishes, and it is not considered that there would a great deal of scope for significant savings under the existing environment budget.

5.11 It should be noted that, in a number of areas of its budget, the present Lilleshall and Donnington Parish Council commands economies of scale in the services that it provides. These serve to mask any real gains or losses that separate parish councils would obtain in their budgets. Some of the areas that currently command economies of scale include councillor expenses, office administration and staff on-costs, subscriptions and insurance, training, room hire, grants to community organisations, grounds maintenance and newsletters. A new parish council might be vulnerable to any additional burdens arising from these lost economies of scale. The assessment here does not provide for any further future expenditure that a separate parish council might wish to incur in due course within their area. However, this would be a matter for a new Parish to set a precept to provide the appropriate level of service.

5.12 Lilleshall Donnington & Muxton Parish Council has provided details of their reserves as they stood at 31 December 2013, when they amounted to £72,810.98. A parish's balances would be transferred to any new parishes in an appropriate proportion based on population.

5.13 Overall, it is concluded that Lilleshall is able to fulfil the basic legal tests required in terms of being a community of identity and having the ability to be financially viable. However, submission responses are mixed to the prospect of a separate Lilleshall parish council. The main issue is the apparent absence of community consensus in the Lilleshall parish ward. The council has no wish to impose revised community governance arrangements on an area without further evidence that a separate Lilleshall Parish council commands wider support within the community. Therefore our draft recommendation is that further direct consultation should take place, in the form of a postal ballot, with the wider Lilleshall electorate, signposting them to the terms of reference documents. Those residents strongly in favour of or against a separate Parish would have the opportunity to provide material to residents before the postal votes were received. The result of such a ballot would help further inform this review and provide a better understanding of what the residents of Lilleshall feel about a separate Parish council. .

6. Summary of Draft Proposals

6.1 The Draft Proposals are that, although Lilleshall appears to fulfil the technical/legal requirements to form a separate Parish, there is, from submissions made to this review, an absence of community consensus. Therefore further direct consultation should take place, in the form of a postal ballot, with Lilleshall electors. The result of such a ballot would help further inform this review and provide a better understanding of what the residents of Lilleshall feel about the formation of a separate Parish council for their area.

7. What happens next?

7.1 The timetable for this Review is as follows:

Table 6 – Timetable for the Review

Action	Timetable	Relevant Date
Terms of Reference are published		2 October 2013
Introductory stage – submissions are invited	Two months	2 October – 30 November 2013
Draft Proposals are prepared	Two months	December 2013 – January 2014
Draft Proposals are published		February 2014
Consultations	Three months	7 February – 9 May
Final Proposals are prepared	Six Weeks	May/June
Final Proposals are published by Boundary Review Committee		July
Licensing Committee publishes the Recommendations	Two weeks later	July
Council publishes the Reorganisation Order	thereafter	

7.2 These Draft Proposals give our initial proposals for the future of community governance in Lilleshall Donnington & Muxton. We now allow a period of three months, in accordance with our timetable at Table 6 above, for consultations on our proposals. Our Final Proposals will be made in response to the outcome of these consultations. They may wholly change our Draft Proposals, because we will endeavour again to encompass the broadly held views of the residents of the affected areas insofar as they are compatible with the legal tests and policies. There will then be a short period before the Council publishes its Recommendations in this Review, and this period allows time for any final submissions and arguments to be made covering matters which may not have arisen earlier in the Review.

7.3 A period for comments on the Draft Proposals has now opened, and this lasts until 9 May.

8. How to contact us

8.1 Comments should be submitted to the Democratic Services team. They can be submitted either by letter or by e-mail.

8.2 You can contact us at:

Electoral Services
2nd Floor
Addenbrooke House
Ironmasters Way
Telford
TF3 4NT

01952 383210

reviews@telford.gov.uk

http://www.telford.gov.uk/info/200169/elections/355/boundary_matters/2

8.3 Details of our officer contacts are as follows:

Jonathan Eatough Assistant Director	Strategic management of the Review	
Phil Griffiths Democratic Services Manager	Project and resource management of the Review	phil.griffiths@telford.gov.uk 01952 383210
	Responding to consultation responses and preparing key consultation documents	melvin.humphreys@telford.gov.uk 01952 383202

9. A List of Annexes

Annex 1 – Submissions received in this Review

Annex 2 Lilleshall Donnington & Muxton Parish council- a disaggregation of the budget between the 3 wards

Submissions received in this review

Petition signed by 340 local government electors of the Lilleshall ward of the parish of Lilleshall, Donnington and Muxton, 12 October 2012

Philip Hawkins, by letters, 08 September 2013, 18 November 2013 , For (1)

Lilleshall, Donnington & Muxton Parish Council, by email, 06 November 2013, Against

Mr J W Hockin, by email, Undated, For (1)

Ralph Morgan, by email, Undated, Against (1)

David Taylor, by email, 12 November 2013, Against (1)

Alistair & Marguerite Balderson, by email, 13 November 2013, For (2)

Shirley Harris, by email, 14 November 2013, Against (1)

Michael Harris, by email, 14 November 2013, Against (1)

Don Marshall, by email, 15 November 2013, For (3)

Paul Whorton, by email, 15 November 2013, Against (1)

Barry Round, by email, 17 November 2013, For (3)

Ann Whittingham, by letter, 18 November 2013, Against (1)

Colleen & John Lowe, by email, 21 November 2013, For (2)

Rosemary Sampson, by email, 21 November 2013, Against (1)

Neil Sampson, by email, 21 November 2013, Against (1)

Mr B Hughes, by letter, 22 November 2013, Against (1)

Phil Ward, by email, 22 November 2013, For (2)

Graham & Rhona Palmer, by email, 22 November 2013, For (2)

Mrs S Hughes, by letter, 23 November 2013, Against (1)

F Graham Platt, by email, 23 November 2013, Against (1)

Calpreta Parkinson, by email, 23 November 2013, For (3)

Simon Collier, by email, 24 November 2013, For, 6

Mrs Mary Ayres, by letter, 25 November 2013, Against (1)

Mr Cedric Ayres, by letter, 25 November 2013, Against (1)

E Anne Platt, by email, 25 November 2013, Against (1)

Ruth Taylor, by email, 25 November 2013, Against (1)

Ian & Christine Robinson, by email, 27 November 2013, For (1)

Jillian & Howard Broadbent, by email, 27 November 2013, For (2)

Mr & Mrs P Cawthorne, by letter, 28 November 2013, For (2)

Keith & Pauline Coffey, by email, 28 November 2013, For (2)

Brian & Christine Leyden, by email, 28 November 2013, No view (2)

Andrew Baker, by email, 29 November 2013, Against (1)

Margaret Marshall, by email, 29 November 2013, For (1)

Carol Baker, by email, 30 November 2013, Against (1)